UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,019	06/15/2006	Michael Pies	CH8456/LeA36830	6117
34947 LANXESS CC	7590 08/28/2007 OR POR ATION		EXAMINER	
111 RIDC PARK WEST DRIVE			WITHERSPOON, SIKARL A	
PITTSBURGH	I, PA 15275-1112		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			. 1621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/583,019	PIES ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	- Art Unit					
		Sikarl A. Witherspoon	1621					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover shee	with the correspondence address -	•				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE IN THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMU 36(a). In no event, however, ma vill apply and will expire SIX (6) No. cause the application to becom	NICATION. y a reply be timely filed NONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ju	ily 2007.						
,—	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.						
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
-	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.							
•	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attac	hed Office Action or form PTO-152	2.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.0	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)⊠ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior							
	application from the International Bureau							
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies	not received.					
<u>'</u>								
Attachmer	nt(s)	_						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date					
3) 🗵 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 7/12/07.		of Informal Patent Application					

Application/Control Number: 10/583,019

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pandey et al (Synthesis, 1982) and Brown (US 2,765,335).

The instant claims are drawn to a method of hydrodehalogenating a halogenated meta-cresol by contacting said compound with a catalyst comprising palladium and/or platinum, and optionally copper, said catalyst being applied to a titania or alumina support.

Pandey et al teach the hydrodehalogenation of 4-chloro-m-cresol with palladium-on-carbon, in a formic acid/dimethylformamide solvent solution. The reference is silent on reaction temperature; however, the examiner presumes all reactions taught in the reference are conducted at reflux temperature (p 878, table).

The differences between Pandey et al and the instant claims are that Pandey et al do not teach a titania or alumina support, does not teach the instant reaction temperature, and does not teach the amount of hydrogen employed, as recited in the instant claims.

Brown however, teaches the production of o-cresol by hydrodehalogenation of 6chloro-cresol. The catalyst exemplified by Brown is a nickel catalyst; however, the Art Unit: 1621

reference teaches that other hydrogenation catalysts, such as platinum, palladium, silver, and copper, may be employed. The catalyst is support on a refractory material, such as alumina. The reaction temperature exemplified is from 300 to 350° C, but would vary depending on the catalyst used. Hydrogen is fed at a hydrogen to chlorocresol ratio of 5 to 1 (col. 1, line 1 to col. 3, line 61).

In view of the combined reference teachings, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a different catalyst support, such as alumina or silica, in the process taught by Pandey et al. It would have also been obvious to adjust the reaction temperature, based on the catalyst employed, in order to maintain the activity of the catalyst, as well as finding the optimum temperature for removing chlorine from the chloro-cresol without causing a disruption of the benzene ring.

Claim Objections

Claims 3-10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to a previous claim in the alternative only, and should not depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikarl A. Witherspoon whose telephone number is 571-272-0649. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/583,019 Page 4

Art Unit: 1621

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 571-272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

saw

SIKARL A. WITHERSPOON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Siker A. Witherson